

REMARKS

Claims 1-15 are all the claims pending in the present application, claim 15 having been added as indicated herein. Claims 10, 11, 13 and 14 are allowed.¹ The Examiner now applies a new reference Ludtke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,501,441) to support the claim rejections. Specifically, claims 1-9 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Ludtke.

Claims 1-9 and 12 are rejected over Ludtke based on the reasons set forth on pages 2-3 of the present Office Action. A brief description of Ludtke is as follows.

Ludtke is directed to an apparatus for partitioning, scaling and displaying video and/or graphics across several display devices. The apparatus includes a video source, a master device and multiple display devices arranged into a multiple display configuration. Preferably, the master device partitions the video stream into image sections and assigns each display device a corresponding image section based on its position within the multiple display configuration. *See Abstract of Ludtke.*

With respect to independent claim 1, Applicant submits that Ludtke does not disclose or suggest that an image display comprises, “a scaler for selecting a video signal corresponding to a predetermined area of the display based on an externally transmitted control signal, and enlarging the selected video signal according to a size of the display,” as recited in amended claim 1. The Examiner alleges that the master device 22 of Ludtke corresponds to the claimed

¹ The Office Action Summary page mistakenly indicates that claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 are objected to and that claims 1-9 and 12 are allowed. This page should read that claims 1-9 and 12 are rejected and that claims 10, 11, 13, and 14 are allowed.

scaler. The Examiner alleges that display devices 24-40 correspond to the claimed image displayers. However, claim 1 describes that each image display comprises, *inter alia*, a scaler for selecting a video signal corresponding to a predetermined area of the display based on an externally transmitted control signal, and enlarging the selected video signal according to a size of the display. Ludtke does not show this, as the master device 22, which allegedly corresponds to the claimed scaler, does not even constitute any of the image display devices 24-40. Therefore, at least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that Ludtke does not anticipate claim 1.

Applicant amends claim 8, as indicated in herein, and submits that this claim is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

Applicant submits that dependent claims 2-7, 9, and 12 are patentable at least by virtue of their respective dependencies from independent claims 1 and 8.

At least based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that Ludtke does not anticipate claims 1-9 and 12.

Also, Applicant adds new independent claim 15 to provide a varying scope of coverage. Applicant submits that this claim is patentable at least based on reasons similar to those set forth above with respect to claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111
U.S. Application No.: 10/714,613

Attorney Docket No.: Q77387

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Diallo T. Crenshaw
Diallo T. Crenshaw
Registration No. 52,778

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: April 11, 2007